

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated January 11, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Applicants cancel claim 5. Claims 1-4 and 6-18 are pending.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 11, 14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,010,384 to Nishino. Claims 6-10, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,426,522 to Takahara. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishino in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,897,414 to Bergeron.

The rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-18 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 1-4 and 6-18 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “hardening the UV sealant other than the UV sealant on the regions where the UV sealant and at least one scribing line are crossed by irradiating a UV ray on the attached substrates with masking regions where the UV sealant and at least one scribing line are crossed, wherein the UV sealant on the regions where the UV sealant and at least one scribing line are crossed is not entirely cured” (claim 1). None of the cited references including Nishino, Takahara, and Bergeron, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The structure of claim 1 of the present invention is different from the Nishino structure in that Nishino discloses hardening the entire sealant surface of the substraten, not “the UV sealant on the regions where the UV sealant and at least one scribing line are crossed is not entirely cured” as recited in claim 1. For example, Nishino discloses “the overall surface of the opposing substrate 200 is coated...with ultraviolet curing acrylic resin...The acrylic resin is then dried” (Nishino, col. 5, lines 44-48).

Nishino does not disclose or suggest "hardening the UV sealant other than the UV sealant on the regions where the UV sealant and at least one scribing line are crossed" as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-4 and 6-18, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

George G. Ballas

Registration No.: 52,587

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant